

IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition No. 96 of 2002 (M/B)

1. Laxmi Varnish Udyog, Nawabi Road,
Haldwani, District Nainital,
Through its Proprietor Ganesh Chand Bhatt,
S/o Laxmi Datt Bhatt.
2. New Rajeev Industries, Pura,
District Nainital through its Proprietor
Tulsi Das Bhatt S/o Laxmi Datt Bhatt.
3. Bhatt Industries, Damuadhara,
Almora through its Proprietor/Partner
Smt. Deepa Bhatt W/o Ganesh Chand Bhatt.
4. Laxmi Varnish Udyog, Damuadhara,
Almora through its Proprietor,
Smt. Deepa Bhatt W/o Ganesh Chand Bhatt.
5. B.V. Udyog, Aartola,
District Almora through its Proprietor
Smt. Deepa Bhatt W/o Ganesh Chand Bhatt.
6. Rajeev Industries, Damuadhara,
Almora through its Proprietor,
Smt. Deepa Bhatt W/o Ganesh Chand Bhatt.
7. Shankar Laghu Udyog, Damuadhara,
Almora through its Proprietor
Tulsi Das Bhatt S/o Laxmi Datt Bhatt.
8. Rajeev Enterprises, Nawabi Road,
Haldwani, District Nainital,
Through its Proprietor Rajesh Kumar Bhatt,
S/o Laxmi Datt Bhatt.
9. J.P. Rosin & Turpentine Factory,
Patal (Thal), District Pithoragarh,
Through its Proprietor Laxmi Datt Bhatt,
S/o Late Mahadev Bhatt.
10. Jageshwar Rosin & Turpentine Factory,
Panuanuala, Almora,
Through its Proprietor/ Partner Harish Bhatt.
11. Trishul Enterprises, Pattharkhani,
District Almora through its Proprietor
Narayan Datt Bhatt. Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Uttaranchal,
through Secretary, Forrest Department,
Government of Uttaranchal, Dehradun.
2. Addl. Secretary, Forest Department,
Government of Uttaranchal, Dehradun.
3. Chief Conservator of Forests,
Uttaranchal, Nainital. Respondents

Mr. Vinay Kumar, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Sudhir Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. N.B. Tewari, Chief Standing Counsel for the respondents.

JUDGMENT

Coram: Hon'ble Rajeev Gupta, C.J.
Hon'ble Prafulla C. Pant, J.

RAJEEV GUPTA, C.J. (Oral)

Mr. Vinay Kumar, Advocate on behalf of Mr. Sudhir Singh,
Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. N.B. Tewari, Chief Standing Counsel for the respondents.

2. Mr. N.B. Tewari, the learned Chief Standing Counsel for the respondents submits that the writ petition, now, has become infructuous.

3. The writ petition, therefore, is dismissed as infructuous.

(Prafulla C. Pant, J.)	(Rajeev Gupta, C.J.)
07.07.2006	07.07.2006

G